



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,582	09/25/2003	Clifton Harold Bromley	03SW169 / ALBRP314US	7480
<div>7590      10/30/2007 Susan M. Donahue Rockwell Automation, 704-P, IP Department 1201 South 2nd Street Milwaukee, WI 53204</div>			<div>EXAMINER KENNEDY, ADRIAN L</div>	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2121	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/670,582

Applicant(s)

BROMLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Adrian L. Kennedy

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/30/04.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Examiner's Detailed Office Action***

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 8/14/07, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

David Vincent

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2121

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-28, 33-35, 37-38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. (USPubN 2003/0120714).

Regarding claim 1:

Wolff et al. teaches,

(Currently Amended) A computer implemented system that renders data in an industrial automation environment (Paragraphs 0001 and 0002; disclosed as an interface for machine vision system), comprising:

a human machine interface (HMI) (P 0016; "*human/machine interface (HMI)*")

that presents the data in a plurality of device platforms (P 0017; "*computer (handheld, laptop or fixed PC), a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA), or another form of remote computing device*"; See Response to Arguments Below);

a device analyzer that determines properties associated with a plurality of devices having disparate device platforms, intended for delivery of data (P 0017; "*the processor, accordingly includes an application that supports transmission and receipt of data in a desired portable-device compatible format*"; See Response to Arguments Below); and

an HMI generator that generates code and/or data for the HMI in accordance with determined properties of the devices (P 0017; "*the processor, accordingly includes an application that supports transmission and receipt of data in a desired portable-device compatible format*"; See Response to Arguments Below),

Art Unit: 2121

and delivers the code and/or data to the respective devices based on attributes of the respective device platforms (P 0044; *“the PDA services layer 410 is a PDA-specific code set that supports the chosen PDA-based HMI device”*; See Response to Arguments Below).

Regarding claim 2:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein the device analyzer comprising a memory and a processor (Figs 2 and 3; processing element 280 and memory 282; page 4, paragraphs 0038 and 0039).

Regarding claim 3:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein the processor utilizes artificial intelligence techniques to properly render the data (P 0052, *“...using an advanced statistical algorithm to convert MVS image data to the appropriate gray level and format based upon weight factors that may favor certain characteristics of the reduced-power display of a PDA”*).

Regarding claim 4:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein the HMI generator automatically modifies code and/or data associated with the HMI for display on a new device for which the HMI was not

Art Unit: 2121

originally configured, wherein the HMI is modified according to the determined properties of the new device (P 0043-0044, modifying a generic application interface into a PDA-specific interface).

Regarding claim 5:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The device analyzer wherein artificial intelligence techniques are employed in connection with manipulating a mapping (P 052, “...*using an advanced statistical algorithm to convert MVS image data to the appropriate gray level and format based upon weight factors that favor certain characteristics of the reduced-power display PDA*”. Disclosed as mapping colors in an image data converting it to the appropriate gray level.).

Regarding claim 6:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system employed in a processing environment comprising at least one of a personal computer; a desktop computer; a laptop computer; a personal digital assistant; a hand-held computer; a cell phone; and a tablet computer (P 0017).

Regarding claim 7:

Wolff et al. teaches

Art Unit: 2121

(Currently Amended) The system wherein one or more of the device(s) coupled to the HMI generator is at least one of: a display; a data store; and a server (Fig. 2, display 250, P 0033).

Regarding claim 8:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein the HMI generator comprising:  
a processing element that facilitates creation of one or more multi-dimensional software objects that render data in multiple dimensions and/or formats at substantially the same time (Fig. 16; P0078-0079; disclosed as making live images and displaying them in the Live Display in real time, allowing for a portion of an image to be magnified and displayed in a zoom window); and  
a component that obtains a common data input for the one or more multi-dimensional software objects (Fig. 2, image element 202; P 0030).

Regarding claim 9:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein specific data is assigned to a software object (P 0066; disclosed as HTML objects).

Regarding claim 10:

Wolff et al. teaches

Art Unit: 2121

(Original) The system wherein the data varies at least one of size; color; translational location; rotation of a software object: text; audio; video; visibility; enable/disable state; object state; object type; object text; trending zoom level; audio volume; specification of audio clips; specification of video clips; and starting and/or stopping animation.

The examiner takes the position that Wolff et al. teaches the features of claim 10 in Paragraph 0065. Wolff et al. teaches texts, states and other data which are included in the disclosed GUI elements as menu, button, etc.

Regarding claim 11:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein changes to the common data input affect the one or more multi-dimensional software objects (P 0078; images are shown in real time, therefore any change in input will affect the images).

Regarding claim 12:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein the HMI generator further comprising:  
a component that associates one or more software objects with one or more physical devices (Fig. 2, images sensor 220; P 0031); and  
a component that generates software objects wherein the one or more software objects are associated with data corresponding to the one or more physical devices (P 0043),



Art Unit: 2121

the physical devices affecting changes to the software objects and the software objects affecting changes to the physical devices (P 0085; disclosed by establishing a two-way communication between the sensor's communication interface and controller's interface).

Regarding claim 13:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein the one or more software objects imported from an outside source (P 0046, generic application that includes GUI objects is loaded over the communication link).

Regarding claim 14:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system further comprising an interface to facilitate selection of data to associate with physical devices (Fig. 9; P 0069; setup page).

Regarding claim 15:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system further comprising an interface to facilitate selection of specific attributes of software objects corresponding to data associated with physical devices (P 0065).

Art Unit: 2121

Regarding claim 16:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system further comprising: a component that renders data based on one or more of a user access data level, a data type and a data state wherein the component is employed in an HMI residing in a processing environment (P 0066; disclosed as a web browser).

Regarding claim 17:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system further comprising a user-based association between displayed data and at least one of: a user access level; a data type; and a data state (Fig. 8 owner window 818, P 0067 discloses associating data with a particular user)

Regarding claim 18:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Currently Amended) A computer implemented system that renders data in an industrial automation environment comprising:

a human machine interface (HMI) (P 0016; *“human/machine interface (HMI)”*;

See Response to Arguments Below) that presents the data to an operator (P 0033;

*“the HMI device includes a display 250 capable of displaying”*; See Response to Arguments Below);

Art Unit: 2121

a component that determines if the format and/or sub-format of the data is known to the system (P 0052; See Response to Arguments Below); and  
an artificial intelligence component that determines the format of unknown data received by the HMI (P 0052; See Response to Arguments Below); and  
a processing component that process and renders the data in the HMI in a suitable format (P 0078).

Regarding claim 19:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein the artificial intelligence locates and renders a partial data set (P 0054).

Regarding claim 20:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein further comprising a memory which stores previously unknown data types to compare with future data (P 0051, "...*the memory organization is altered so that it comports with the format preferred by a PDA*").

Regarding claim 21:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein the HMI renders the data into at least one of text; audio; video; static image(s); and interactive image(s) (P 0078, displaying images in real time).

Art Unit: 2121

Regarding claim 22:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein in providing an error message when data cannot be rendered (P 0066; disclosed as rendering through a web browser. It would have been widely known by one of ordinary skill in the art, that an error message is presented in a web browser when said browser is unable to render web page data, due to an inability to reach a particular web page.).

Regarding claim 23:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The system wherein data is rendered in a format and/or sub-format suitable to the display capabilities of the device on which the data is to be presented (P 0056).

Regarding claim 24:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Currently Amended) A method to display data based at least in part on a zoom level selected by a user comprising:

displaying data associated with process points in a plurality of disparate views, the data can be hidden or exposed to the user in respective disparate views (P 0054; See Response to Arguments Below); and

Art Unit: 2121

displaying respective views associated with a corresponding zoom level (P 0079;

See Response to Arguments Below).

Regarding claim 25:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The method further comprising:

presenting data associated with a zoom level chosen by the user (P 0054); and

suppressing data associated with a zoom level chosen by the user (P 0079).

Regarding claim 26:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The method further comprising assigning the data and the zoom levels (P

0079, selecting portion of an image for zooming using a stylus and displaying on the Live

Image screen).

Regarding claim 27:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The method further comprising allowing the zoom level and the data to be

associated in a non-linear relationship (P 0079, selected area of any size can be magnified

to fill the screen).

Regarding claim 28:

Art Unit: 2121

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The method further comprising an artificial intelligence component capable of inferring a default zoom level based on a user preference (P 0079, user expresses the preferences by selecting an area with a stylus; selected area is zoomed to a default level by fitting selected image to fill the screen).

Regarding claim 33:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Currently Amended) A computer implemented method that facilitates rendering of data in an industrial automation environment (Paragraphs 0001 and 0002; disclosed as an interface for machine vision system), comprising:

determining formatting requirements (P 0052; See Response to Arguments Below) associated with a plurality of devices having disparate platforms, intended for delivery of data (P 0017; “*computer (handheld, laptop or fixed PC), a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA), or another form of remote computing device*” ; See Response to Arguments Below); and

formatting the data respectively in accordance with the determined formatting requirements of the devices (Page 6, left column, lines 12-16; See Response to Arguments Below);

delivering the formatted data to the respective devices (Page 6, left column, line 16-21; See Response to Arguments Below);

Art Unit: 2121

displaying (P 0044; “*creation of a specific set of GUI display screens and buttons*”) the formatted data based on attributes of the respective device platform (See Response to Arguments Below).

Regarding claim 34:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Original) The method further comprising reformatting data associated with an existing HMI for delivery to a newly detected device based on the determined formatting requirements of the newly detected device (P 0043-0044, modifying a generic application interface into a PDA-specific interface).

Regarding claim 35:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Currently Amended) A computer implemented method that facilitates rendering of data in an industrial automation environment (P 0001-0002; disclosed as an interface for a machine vision system) comprising:

receiving data from a physical device to an HMI (Page 6, left column, lines 1-10);

and

comparing the data format to data formats known to the HMI (Page 6, paragraph 0052, See Response to Arguments Below); and

determining the format of unknown data received by the HMI (Page 6, paragraph 0052; See Response to Arguments Below); and

Art Unit: 2121

processing (P 0052, disclosed as formatting); and  
rendering the data in the HMI in a suitable format (P 0078).

Regarding claim 37:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Currently Amended) A computer implemented system facilitates rendering of data in an industrial automation environment (Paragraphs 0001 and 0002; disclosed as an interface for machine vision system), comprising:

means to determine properties associated with a plurality of devices intended for delivery of data (P 0050, properties of PDA are determined when a communication with MVS is established; see also paragraph 0047 for additional disclosure of properties established through a handshaking process; See Response to Arguments Below); and  
means to format the data respectively in accordance with the determined properties of the devices (P 0044); and  
means to deliver the formatted data to the respective devices (P 0050, “...*machine vision program is stored in the sensor's program memory 284 (or another dedicate memory), and is transferred into the PDA when requested by the PDA via the PDA services layer*”).

Regarding claim 38:

Wolff et al. teaches



Art. Unit: 2121

(Currently Amended) A computer implemented system that facilitates rendering of data in an industrial automation environment (Paragraphs 0001 and 0002; disclosed as an interface for machine vision system) comprising:

means to determine if a format of the data is known to the system (P 0052, application software converts image data from an MVS format to a format acceptable in a PDA); and

means to determine the format of unknown data received by the HMI (P 0052; See Response to Arguments Below); and

means to process and render the data in the HMI in a suitable format (P 0078).

Regarding claim 40:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Currently Amended) A computer implemented system that displays data based at least in part on a zoom level selected by a user comprising:

means to display data associated with process points in a plurality of disparate views, the data can be hidden or exposed to the user in respective disparate views (P 0054; See Response to Arguments Below); and

means to display respective views associated with a corresponding zoom level (P 0079; See Response to Arguments Below).

3. Claims 29-32, 36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. (USPubN 2003/0120714) in view of Shteyn (USPN 6,199,136).

Regarding claims 29, 36 and 39:

Wolff et al. teaches

(Currently Amended) A computer implemented system that facilitates recognizing and/or creating a software object representing a physical device (Paragraphs 0001 and 0002; disclosed as an interface for machine vision system), comprising:

an HMI generator that formats the data respectively in accordance with the determined properties of the devices (P 0044);

Shteyn teaches

A software object generator that determines properties associated with a plurality of devices intended for creation of the software object (col. 6, lines 14-17 and col. 4, lines 5-25; See Response to Arguments Below); and

an HMI that controls the physical device utilizing the software object representing the device (col. 2, lines 1-22; "*device control model*"; and col. 6, lines 28-33; See Response to Arguments Below).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to combine the invention of Wolff et al. with the invention of Shteyn for the purpose of controlling devices using abstract representations (C 1, L 57-58).

Regarding claim 30:

Shteyn teaches

Art Unit: 2121

(Original) The system further comprising an artificial intelligence component utilized to recognize a new device added to the system (col. 4, lines 27-50; disclose as the recognition of new devices with any additional functionality that is not present in the embedded device control module).

Regarding claim 31:

Shteyn teaches

(Original) The system further comprising recognizing substantially all the components coupled to the system (col. 4, lines 20-25).

Regarding claim 32:

Shteyn teaches

(Original) The system further comprising a mapping element to provide connectivity to the physical devices (col. 3, lines 37-39).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on August 14, 2007 have been fully considered but are found to be non-persuasive. The unpersuasive arguments made by the Applicant are stated below:

In reference to Applicant's argument:

There is nothing in these paragraphs or elsewhere in the cited document to disclose or suggest a *device analyzer that determines properties associated with a plurality of device **having disparate device platforms**, intended for delivery of data.*

Art Unit: 2121

## Examiner's response:

The examiner has considered the applicant's argument, but has found the applicant's argument to be non-persuasive. This is due substantially to the broadness of the applicant's claimed invention.

**During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. MPEP 2111.01 [R-5]**

Due to the lack of a specific claiming in the applicant's claimed invention, the examiner has taken the position that a "device analyzer" is any object that "determines properties associated with a plurality of devices having disparate device platforms" or facilitates the "[determining of the] properties associated with a plurality of device having disparate device platforms".

Therefore, based on a broadest interpretation of this claiming, the examiner has found that the applicant's claiming would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in light of Wolff et al. teaching the use of an "*application*" (the applicant's claimed "device analyzer") which "*supports transmission and receipt of data in a desired portable-device compatible format and speed*" (the applicant's claimed "determining of properties" is obvious in light of Wolff et al. teaching the "*transmission and receipt of data in a desired portable-device compatible format and speed*") for a "*web browser*" and "*PDA*" (i.e. applicant's claimed "disparate device platforms"). (The above citations from the invention of Wolff et al. are found in Paragraph 0017 of his disclosure.)

## In reference to Applicant's argument:

There is nothing in paragraphs [0044] or [0050] or elsewhere in this cited document to disclose or suggest an *HMI generator that generates code and/or data for the HMI in accordance with determined properties of the devices, and delivers the code and/or data to respective devices*

Art Unit: 2121

*based on attributes of the respective device platforms*, as recited in claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 33 and 37).

Examiner's response:

The examiner has considered the applicant's argument, but has found the applicant's argument to be non-persuasive. The examiner takes the position that an "HMI generator" is any object that "generates code and/or data for the HMI in accordance with determined properties of the devices, and delivers the code and/or data to the respective devices based on attributes of the respective device platforms". The examiner takes the position that applicant's claimings would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in light of Wolff et al. teaching the "*formatting*" (the applicant's claimed "generation") of "*data communicated*" (the applicant's claimed "[delivering of] code and/or data") "*so that it is read at a data speed and level of resolution [...] this is appropriate to the portable device*" (the applicant's claimed "code and/or data" which is "based on attributes of the respective device platforms"). (The above citations from the invention of Wolff et al. are found in Paragraph 0017 of his disclosure.)

In reference to Applicant's argument:

There is no disclosure or suggestion of any sort of multiple device flexibility...

Examiner's response:

The examiner has considered the applicant's arguments, but has found the applicant's argument to be non-persuasive. The examiner takes the position that the support for "multiple device flexibility" in the invention of Wolff et al., would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in light of him teaching that his portable device can be a "*web-browser equipped computer*

Art Unit: 2121

*(handheld, laptop, or fixed PC), a Person Digital Assistant (PDA), or another form of remote computing device” and in teaching the “transmission and receipt of data in a desired portable-device” for “web browser viewing and a PDA”. (The above citations from the invention of Wolff et al. are found in Paragraph 0017 of his disclosure.)*

In reference to Applicant’s argument:

*In any event, Wolff et al. is simply concerned with compressing image data, and there is nothing in this passage that discloses or suggests a component that determines if the format and/or sub-format of the data is known to the system.*

Examiner’s response:

The examiner has considered the applicant’s argument, but has found the applicant’s argument to be non-persuasive. The examiner takes the position that the applicant’s broadly claimed “component that determines if the format and/or sub-format of the data is known” is inherent in the invention of Wolff et al. This inherency is present in Wolff et al. teaching the “*transmission and receipt of data in a desired portable-device compatible format*”. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that the “*transmission and receipt of data*” in a “*portable-device compatible format*” would not have been possible if said “format” was not known.

In reference to Applicant’s argument:

*Additionally, there is no disclosure or suggestion within the four corners of Wolff et al. of an artificial intelligence component that determines the format of unknown data received by the HMI, as recited in amended claim 18 (and similarly independent claims 35 and 38).*

Examiner’s response:

Art Unit: 2121

The examiner has considered the applicant's argument, but has found the applicant's argument to be non-persuasive. The examiner takes the position that while the applicant's claimed invention recites the use of an "artificial intelligence component". However, this claiming is substantially broad. The examiner has found that a non-limiting reasonable interpretation of the phrase "artificial intelligence component" would be any component that will facilitate logical operations. While this interpretation may not be the applicant's intended interpretation, the examiner asserts that this interpretation would have been known by one of ordinary skill in the art and does not teach against the applicant's disclosure.

Therefore, based on the broadness of the applicant's claimed "artificial intelligence component", the examiner additionally takes the position that the said "component" would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, in light of Wolff et al. teaching the use of "*a variety of techniques can be employed for converting image data [...] to a format acceptable in a PDA*" (Paragraph 0052). This obviousness is supported by the fact that the applicant's "artificial intelligence component" is a subset of the "variety of techniques" taught by Wolff et al., where both the "component" and the "techniques" are used to determine the format of data to be delivered to an "HMI" (the PDA in the invention Wolff et al.).

In reference to Applicant's argument:

There is nothing in these paragraphs nor the remainder of the cited document that discloses or suggests *displaying data associated with process points in a plurality of disparate views, the data can be hidden or exposed to the user in respective disparate views*, as recited in amended claim 24 (and similarly independent claim 40).

Examiner's response:

The examiner has considered the applicant's argument, but has found the applicant's argument to be non-persuasive. Due to the lack of a specific recitation as to what is meant by the phrase "displaying data associated with process points" in the applicant's claimed invention, the examiner takes the position that the applicant's previously cited claiming would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in light of Wolff et al. teaching the "[displaying] of images" (applicant's claimed displayed data) during the process of "magnification" (applicant's claimed process) which is taught in Paragraph 0054. The examiner additionally asserts that it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that displayed images are associated with specific process points during the process of magnification.

In reference to Applicant's argument:

There is nothing in these passages or elsewhere in this cited document that would disclose or suggest a *software object generator that determines properties associated with a plurality of devices intended for creation of the software object.*

Examiner's response:

The examiner has considered the applicant's argument, but has found the applicant's argument to be non-persuasive. Due to the broad recitation of the applicant's "software object generator" the examiner takes the position that the applicant's claimed "software object generator" is any object "that determines properties associated with a plurality of devices intended for creation of the software object". Therefore, based on this position, the examiner asserts that the applicant's claimed "software object generator" would have been obvious in light of Shteyn teaching the modeling of devices as abstract representations of said objects (applicant's claimed software object generator that creates software objects) where the modeling



Art Unit: 2121

uses the properties of the device to expose the device controls (applicant's claimed determining of properties associated with a plurality of devices) in Column 6, Lines 14-17. Furthermore, the examiner has found that it would have been of obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to call the object which facilitates the process of generating abstract representations of devices, a "software object generator".

In reference to Applicant's argument:

Neither is there any disclosure or suggestion of an *HMI generator [that] formats data respectively in accordance with the determined properties of the devices.*

Examiner's response:

The examiner has considered the applicant's argument and consider the applicant's argument moot in light of the newly presented rejection, as set forth above.

In reference to Applicant's argument:

And clearly, nothing in this cited document discloses or suggests an *HMI that controls the physical device utilizing the software object representing the device.*

Examiner's response:

The examiner has considered the applicant's argument, but has found the applicant's argument to be non-persuasive. The examiner takes the position that the applicant's claimed "controlling of a physical device utilizing the software object representing the device", is obvious in light of Shteyn teaching the "manipulation" of an "object by setting or retrieving its properties". Where, when the properties of the object are set or modified, the corresponding device's properties are set or modified (Column 6, Lines 28-33).


Art Unit: 2121

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adrian L. Kennedy whose telephone number is (571) 270-1505. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon -Fri 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Vincent can be reached on (571) 272-3080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALK

  
David Vincent  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100